

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-26 and 28-33 have been considered in the Office Action.

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-12, 28 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Jackelen et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0053810 (“Jackelen”).

Claims 4-5, 9, 13-15 and 18-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Jackelen and Behlok U.S. Patent No. 6,469,805 (“Behlok”).

Reply to the § 102(e) Rejections

Applicants have cancelled claims 1-9 without prejudice.

Independent claim 10 recites a method for analyzing a print job comprising an object having an associated print attribute, the method including determining a print attribute of interest, associating a corresponding unique marker to the determined attribute of interest, receiving PDL commands that describe the print job, interpreting the PDL commands to process the object, determining if the attribute associated with the processed object matches the determined attribute of interest, and reporting the results of any matched object using the corresponding unique marker. The cited references do not describe the claimed invention.

Jackelen describes methods for processing a print job that includes attributes that specify resources required to successfully complete the print job. (¶3, lines 2-8; ¶15, lines 6-11). Print job attributes may be included in a print job header (i.e., before the first page of the print job), and also may be specified after the header for individual pages in the print job. (¶6, lines 1-6; ¶7, lines 8-11). If a specified print job attribute is not supported by the printer, a “mismatch state” exists, and the printer will be unable to print the print job as desired. (¶4, lines 8-12). In some instances, a printer may support the header attributes, but may not support page attributes specified for individual pages. (¶7, lines 1-11). As a result, a mismatch may be discovered only after the print job is partially printed. (¶6, lines 7-9).

Jackelen describes methods of detecting mismatches during rendering of a print job and notifying an operator of the existence and nature of the detected mismatch state. (¶10, lines 1-5). In particular, at step 100, a print job is received, and at step 102,

the print job header is parsed to determine the header attributes. (¶18, lines 4-5). At step 104, a pre-job mismatch check is performed to determine if there is a mismatch between any header attribute and the available printer resources and capabilities. (¶18, lines 5-9). If there is no pre-job mismatch, at step 120, each page is individually rendered. (¶19, lines 1-3). As each page is rendered, at step 122 an inquiry is made to determine if any mismatch exists between any page attribute and the available printer resources and capabilities. (¶19, lines 3-6). If no mismatch is detected, the page is sent to the marking engine for printing. (¶19, lines 6-9).

Applicants respectfully submit that Jackelen does not describe or suggest the claimed invention. First, the preamble of claim 10 recites a print job including an object having an associated print attribute. The Office action seems to gloss over this element, and never identifies any print job object having an associated print attribute. This oversight is even more glaring with respect to the second determining step, described below.

Nevertheless, with regard to the first determining step (i.e., determining a print attribute of interest), the Office action states that ¶18, lines 4-5 describes this element. In this regard, the Office action apparently means that one or more header attributes constitute a determined print attribute of interest.

Even if that is correct, Jackelen does not describe or suggest associating a corresponding unique marker to the determined attribute of interest. In this regard, the Office action states that ¶18, lines 5-9 describe this element. However, the cited portion does not describe anything about associating a corresponding unique marker to one or more of the header attributes, but merely states that the pre-job mismatch check inquires whether there is a mismatch between any header attribute and the available printer resources. The Office action does not explain how such a mismatch check constitutes associating a corresponding unique marker to the determined attribute of interest.

Further, Jackelen does not describe or suggest the second determining step (i.e., determining if the attribute associated with the object matches the determined attribute of interest). Based on the Office action's interpretation of the "attribute of interest" described above, the second determining step thus requires determining if the attribute associated with the object matches a header attribute. Jackelen does not

describe or suggest this step, and the Office action's discussion with respect to this claim element is illogical.

In particular, the Office action states that this step is described by ¶19, lines 3-6. However, the cited portion does not describe or suggest anything about determining if an attribute associated with an object matches a header attribute, but instead describes determining if any mismatch exists between printer resources and individual page attributes. The distinction between header attributes and page attributes is key to Jackelen – if all resource mismatches could be determined simply by checking for mismatches between printer resources and header attributes, there would be no need to perform individual page checks to determine mismatches between printer resources and page attributes.

Further, even if there were no such distinction, the cited portion does not describe or suggest anything about matching object attributes with attributes of interest, but instead merely describes determining mismatches between printer resources and print job attributes.

Finally, Jackelen does not describe or suggest reporting the results of any matched object using the corresponding unique marker. The Office action states that this element is described in ¶20. However, ¶20 does not describe or suggest anything about reporting the results of any matched object using a corresponding unique marker, but instead merely states that if a mismatch is detected between printer resources and a page attribute, the job is placed on hold, and a message is displayed on the printer user interface informing the operator of the existence and nature of the mismatch. To the extent that the Office action now suggests that the displayed message is the “unique marker,” the Office action provides no explanation of how the displayed message is associated to a determined attribute of interest, as required by claim 10.

Because Jackelen does not describe or suggest the claimed invention, applicants respectfully submit that the § 102(e) rejection of claim 10 should be withdrawn. In addition, because claims 11-26 and 28-33 depend from claim 10, applicants further respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 11-26 and 28-33 also should be withdrawn. Further, because the cited references do not describe or suggest the claimed invention, applicants respectfully submit that claims 10-26 and 28-33 should be allowed.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, applicants submit that this application, including claims 10-26 and 28-33, is allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner allow this application.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Trosino/
James Trosino
Registration No. 39,862
Attorney for Applicants